

Districts and Public Engagement Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Devolution in Birmingham: The Journey

First Draft for Comment 5 September 2012

1 Overview

- 1.1 Devolution in Birmingham has been a topic of discussion for at least a decade. It was first implemented in April 2004. The work currently being undertaken by the Districts and Public Engagement Overview and Scrutiny Committee is, arguably, the fifth occasion which members of scrutiny have examined the topic.
- 1.2 This report aims to paint a quick pen portrait of the journey to date. It is derived from reports of the City Council, the Executive and Scrutiny. It is intended that this provides an overview for those who have not been involved in the journey, but also it is hoped that it will prompt comment, different perspectives, and if necessary, correction from those who have been involved.

2 2000

- 2.1 The **Democracy Commission** which included councillors and other representatives from the public and private sectors was chaired by Sir Adrian Cadbury and reported in July 2000. It found that there was a need to link the neighbourhood with the City Council.¹ The approach recommended related to decentralisation of power and stronger links to the community. It was suggested that power be decentralised to the community level, that parish councils be set up where there was local demand, improving and simplifying the coverage of groups representing residents and even reducing the size of wards.²³ At this time the city was run by a Labour administration.

3 2002

- 3.1 The **first report to the City Council** on localisation and devolution was in November 2002 and was in the context of the "*flourishing neighbourhoods*" agenda. It set out the framework for establishing constituency committees

¹ Adrian Cadbury's Inaugural Attwood Address [notes] (2002)

² *Birmingham Post* 6 July 2000 "Public 'must vote on Mayor' Democracy Commission ballot call"

³ <http://www.lgcplus.com/lgc-news/birmingham-commission-urges-referendum-on-elected-mayor/1370407.article5> July, 2000

and of delegations (see appendix 1 for their terms of reference). The terms were defined in this report as follows:

- Localisation referring to service delivery and the management and activity of staff;
- Devolution referring to political decision-making and the role of councillors.⁴

3.2 The purpose of localisation and devolution were set out at this point.⁵ The aims for localisation included:

- Local delivery of high quality key public services;
- Greater involvement of the community;
- Provision of locally run access points for local services;
- Integrated local working;
- Local partnership working;
- Culture change to ensure officers work for the community.

3.3 The aims for devolution included:

- Delegation of decisions to all councillors from the Cabinet Members to enable local priorities to be met and local agreement on how to best deliver services to meet the needs of local people, subject to overarching policy frameworks;
- Enhancement of local democracy and community leadership through opportunities for the electorate to be able to influence service decisions;
- Enabling some differences in local governance arrangements.

3.4 The other significant work during 2002 was Anne Power's **Independent Housing Review** which reported in December 2002⁶. The council's intention following this was to establish eleven community based housing organisations (CBHOs), with an initial focus proposed on two pathfinders (Hodge Hill and Northfield).

⁴ Co-ordinating O&S Committee (July 2006) *Devolution and Localisation*

⁵ *Devolution and Localisation* 2006 report

⁶ Report of the Independent Commission of Inquiry into the Future of Council Housing in Birmingham, *One Size Doesn't Fit All* (December 2002)

4 2003 – 2004

- 4.1 In April 2003 the City Council considered the *Localisation and Devolution Project Plan* and the proposals were agreed.⁷ It included an aspiration that the process of devolution would be a driver for change for continual improvement in the delivery and quality of services and to:

“enable and empower local communities to accelerate the process of community regeneration and social cohesion.”

- 4.2 The plan declared that at worst localisation was to be cost neutral (aside from some transition costs). It set out the governance framework and the aim of new committees:

“Constituency Committees, consisting of all the councillors from the relevant Wards, will have a significant role within the overall framework of city governance. They will be taking on extensive decision making powers in relation to localised services and will play a leading role in the development of local community governance. They will want to consider further devolution of powers to Ward Committees or to other levels and the relationship between these bodies and other local mechanisms for community involvement and decision making. Over time they will be able to develop a wider role in the planning of local public services delivered through a range of agencies and organisations.”⁸

- 4.3 The report emphasised the need for community development and the concern that those resources were too scattered to support constituencies' work of building capacity. This report envisaged that the housing service would be restructured to ensure the Local Housing Manager reported to the Constituency Director. The aim was for this to be in place by March 2004⁹ with a four year programme of establishing CBHOs.¹⁰ However, it was proposed that the poor repairs service was not devolved until it had achieved a one star rating from the Audit Commission.

- 4.1 This report set out the complexity of the city and the need to ensure a wide range of stakeholders were involved including councillors, officers, and the third sector. It suggested that:

⁷ *Localisation and Devolution Project Plan*, report of the Executive, April 2003

⁸ *Devolution and Localisation 2006* report

⁹ *Ibid*

¹⁰ Report to Cabinet Committee Devolution (October 2003) *Housing Devolution*

“Above all this must be seen a process of cultural change, rather than one which is dominated by the planning of new structures of management and accountability.”

- 4.5 It was suggested that the cultural change programme could be judged through the following questions:
- Increasing speed – can a particular service be provided more quickly?
 - Raising quality – Can the quality be improved?
 - Securing equality – Does the service reach everyone and does it help social cohesion?
 - Encouraging innovation – Can services be shared or delivered in a different way?
 - Raising satisfaction – Are residents satisfied with the service?
 - Cost efficiency – Can costs be controlled or duplication avoided?
- 4.6 Appendix 7 of that report set out a programme for cultural change. This also set out questions for the constituencies to address relating to the anticipated differences of services after localisation, staff development and motivation; sharing of good practice and lessons learnt; service improvement through performance monitoring and customer feedback; and developing partnerships and relationships.
- 4.7 During 2003-04 the city was run by a minority Labour administration. It was also a transitional year for devolution with constituency committees being established to be able to take on their responsibilities and Constituency Directors appointed.
- 4.8 The proposals were debated further at **City Council in October 2003**. In December 2003 a Cabinet key decision was made regarding the delegation of services from the Directorates of Housing; Leisure, Sport and Culture; Local Services and Community Safety; and Transportation and Street Services.¹¹ (See Appendix 2 for details of which services were devolved).
- 4.9 A **task and finish overview and scrutiny group** chaired by Cllr Hugh McCallion was set up in 2003 (reporting in early 2004) with one of its aims

¹¹ Report to Co-ordinating O&S Committee (March 2004) *Scrutiny of Constituency Committee Decisions*

being to add value to the Executive's proposals prior to the first tranche of services being devolved in April 2004.¹² One of its concerns related to a lack of opportunity for the emerging constituency chairs to be involved in policy development due, in part to a

“Lack of resources available at local level to support localisation and devolution.”

4.10 With reference to progress on the community based housing organisation pathfinders developing at the time the report notes something that is still true today:

“For a devolution initiative, differing approaches in different parts of the city must be entirely appropriate.”

4.11 The report also concluded that it was appropriate for a set of city-wide core standards to be developed, but noted that cabinet and constituency chairs required a shared understanding of how they had been developed.

4.12 By January 2004 achievements included:

- Establishment of a new directorate and appointment of the Strategic Director of Local Services;
- Recruitment of four of the eleven Constituency Directors;
- Senior managers for the directorate in place through a lift and shift process and a similar process underway for constituency staff;
- Identification of suitable accommodation for the majority of constituencies;
- Constituency committees operating with Chairs appointed;
- Establishing a staff and councillors training and development program, to support the cultural changes that will be required.¹³

4.13 In March of that year the Cabinet Committee agreed the service level agreements (SLAs) and requested that constituency committees endorse them. These were for:

¹² Policy and Performance Task and Finish O&S Committee (January 2004) *Devolution and Localisation Interim Issues Report*

¹³ Report to Cabinet Committee Devolution (January 2004) *Devolution and Localisation Implementation Plan*

- Parks management, grounds maintenance, playground services, ranger services (leisure, sport and culture portfolio);
- Pest control services, fleet and waste management, street cleansing and recycling (transportation and street services portfolio).

4.14 The aim was that these were agreements between the service providers (the appropriate assistant director) and the service purchaser (the constituency director) and set out the details of the service to be provided, the standards to be adhered to and the processes for consultation and review with constituency committees.¹⁴

5 2004–2006

5.1 The administration of the City Council changed in June 2004 and for the next eight years a Conservative / Liberal Democrat partnership shaped the policy.

5.2 A 2005 report on devolution and localisation by the **District Auditor** concluded that the:

“Devolution and Localisation approach was not embedded in the culture and operations of the City Council.”¹⁵

5.3 During 2004-2006 Cllr Michael Wilkes chaired the **Co-ordinating Overview and Scrutiny Committee** which reported to Council in July 2006 on *Devolution and Localisation* (the recommendations are in Appendix 3). In the committee’s report it was noted that not all the initial plans had come to fruition:

“Museums, central library services and city-wide arts development became part of the Learning and Culture Strategic Directorate (now itself superseded).

Pest control became a centrally-managed service governed by a Service Level Agreement rather than fully localised.

Most noticeably, the agenda for the Housing service became one of a central drive to improve the service, with the proposals to develop CBHOs put on hold.”¹⁶

¹⁴ Report to Cabinet Committee Devolution (June 2007) *Minimum Service Standards and Service Level Agreements – DL Action Plan R7 and R10*

¹⁵ *Devolution and Localisation* O&S 2006 report

- 5.4 One issue relates to how budgets are allocated to districts. The 2006 report sets out the rationale for the budgets developed (see Table 1).

Table 1: Basis of Districts' Budget Allocations

Service	Allocation basis
Highways	SLA: Road length/no. of street lights
School Crossing	Actual hours per site
Car Parking	Historical direct costs/income
Libraries	Historical direct costs
Pest Control	SLA: 2004/5 number of referrals
Ward Support	Allocation of Ward Support Staff (net of NRF)
Community Development	Historical direct costs
Children's Play	Historical direct costs
Street Cleansing	SLA: Activity levels
Refuse Collection	SLA: Number of households
Sport and Leisure	Historical direct costs
Parks and Allotments	SLA: Historical expenditure
Neighbourhood Advice	Historical direct costs
Community Arts	Allocation per ward
Your City Your Birmingham	Allocation agreed in March 2004
Directorate and Administration	Agreed structures

- 5.5 The issue of SLAs has been highlighted throughout the reports over the decade. This scrutiny review concluded that:

“Originally SLAs were put forward as a means by which a locality could influence and indeed vary centrally driven services. They are now, however, seen as controlling agreements for providing pre-determined, rigid and monolithic services.”

- 5.6 Following the scrutiny review a ***devolution and localisation action plan*** was drawn up (and accepted at City Council in October 2006) with regular reporting to the Cabinet Committee Devolution.
- 5.7 Following this **Cabinet Committee Devolution** agreed the principle of developing further proposals for devolution and localisation. It was agreed that the overriding factor would be service improvement and value for

money. The report proposed a service review gateway process to enable a service to be localised where there was a demonstrable business case.¹⁷

5 2008

- 5.1 Arguably, the direction changed during 2008 with a report in February of that year setting out a vision for **Achieving Excellence with Communities**, linked to the "*global city, local heart*" brand and the "*vibrant urban villages*" aspirations:

"'Going Local' and 'Devolution and Localisation' are labels that refer to a particular process. The fresh emphasis is on 'Achieving Excellence with Communities'. This marks a refreshed focus on attaining outcomes through localised Council structures that engage effectively with all the citizens in their area."¹⁸

6 2010–12

- 6.1 By 2010 the responsibilities of constituency committees were well established. In addition to service delivery they had responsibilities to develop the annual constituency service plan, set and monitor the budget; and identify opportunities to improve the economic, social or environmental well-being of the citizens of Birmingham. Constituency Committees also worked in partnership, with most setting up a Constituency Strategic Partnership, responsible for developing a Constituency Community Plan.
- 6.2 The majority of the 31 neighbourhood management projects under the 2008-11 Neighbourhoods Programme (and the 2006-8 neighbourhood element pilots prior to that) were managed by constituency officers, ensuring alignment of neighbourhood working with constituencies.
- 6.3 In 2009/10, Constituency budgets ranged between £16m (Ladywood) and £8m (Hodge Hill).¹⁹ On average, 55% of these budgets were bound in Service Level Agreements with centrally managed services such as refuse collection and grounds maintenance.

¹⁷ Report to Cabinet Committee Devolution (February 2007) *Scrutiny Review of Devolution and Localisation Recommendation 15*.

¹⁸ Report to Cabinet Committee Devolution (February 2008) *Achieving Excellence with Communities – A refreshed vision*

¹⁹ 2009/10 Budget Outturn figures – reports to Constituency Committees available on www.birmingham.gov.uk/democracy

- 6.4 In July 2010, the **Cabinet Committee (Achieving Excellence with Communities)** put forward a proposal for consultation on changes to the current structure of Constituency Committees and delegations of Executive decision-making.²⁰
- 6.5 The proposals to consult on the future shape of localisation were based around three areas:
- Local service delegations held by constituency committees and corresponding service delivery responsibilities held by constituency teams;
 - Locality structures for governance including decision making, local influence and engagement;
 - How emerging national policies around “localism” and “big society” could offer an opportunity for Birmingham to refocus its own localisation policy and practice.
- 6.5 The intention was also to review value for money, financial capacity and localised service delivery.
- 6.6 This consultation took place over August - October 2010. The **Local Services and Community Safety O&S Committee**, chaired by Councillor James Hutchings, agreed to present a formal response to this consultation.
- 6.7 The Local Services and Community Safety O&S Committee’s response set out a set of principles against which decision making should be assessed (See Appendix 4).²¹
- 6.8 In 2012, chaired by Councillor Neville Summerfield, the **Local Services and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee** again looked at the topic, reporting to City Council on their *Resourcing Devolution* review in February. The golden threads running through the report were:
- Achieving cultural change;
 - Strengthening local influence and flexibility;

²⁰ *Taking Forward The Localism Agenda - Consultation Proposals Around Constituencies*, Report of the Strategic Director of Housing and Constituencies, 26 July 2010

²¹ Local Services and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee (July 2010) *Localisation: Response to the Consultation on The Future Shape of Localisation*

- Maximising resources;
- Building capacity.

6..9 The recommendations which have not yet been tracked (it was expected that the Cabinet Member report back to that committee in the autumn) are in Appendix 5.

6.10 In May 2012 a Labour administration was elected again and the **Leader's statement** to City Council in June set out the new direction for the devolution journey²²:

“Devolution and localisation is at the heart of our vision for Birmingham. We will:

- Create in the months ahead a new Local Services Directorate to deliver a range of local services through integrated neighbourhood management teams. Services will include housing management, youth services, community and play services, community libraries, community safety, neighbourhood offices, sport and leisure, refuse, highways and environmental wardens.
- Improve accountability to residents and opportunities to influence services at the local level, with Ward Committees being the major means of local people engaging on issues affecting their area. We have created 10 District Committee that will have responsibility for a considerable range of executive responsibilities and budgets, with the District Chairs invited to attend and participate in the Council's Cabinet meetings.
- Develop an independent community development and neighbourhood management virtual network. This will enable voluntary, community and resident groups, active citizens and practitioners to share their learning, discuss their needs and shape solutions. This will be a low cost tool, self-managed and use relevant social media tools.
- Put in place shortly an infrastructure support and enabling programme for community, neighbourhood, voluntary and

²² Sir Albert Bore (June 2012) *Leader's Policy Statement*

resident's organisations to enable them to play a full role in the Council's approach to localisation and respond to the national localism agenda.

- Develop a new strategy for neighbourhoods. This will be one of the most ambitious programmes for social cohesion and regeneration at a neighbourhood level that will build on the present Neighbourhood Budget pilots, and will develop ideas on social investment and prevention – including work with troubled families.”

7 Conclusions

7.1 It can be seen that it has been a long process to reach this point in the devolution journey and whilst many issues have been resolved in that time themes and issues of concern thread through many of the reports. These include the thorny issue of achieving cost effectiveness through city wide contracts against locally managing them through service level agreements. Another frequent thread is about how to achieve cultural change in an organisation and city both of immense size. One of the conclusions of the 2006 scrutiny review is, arguably, still relevant:

“Many witnesses spoke of Devolution and Localisation as a process of long-term change. Some thought it too soon to make any evaluation. The Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety was not alone in referring to the process as a journey that Birmingham has embarked upon, rather than a destination that the City Council, partners and citizens have reached.

We understand the rationale for such a view. But we are keen to see the better services and the more coherent, flexible and imaginative use of resources that Devolution and Localisation ought to be able to bring. The destination needs to be made clearer, together with a route for, and expected time of, arrival.”

7.2 The words of an earlier scrutiny report also apply as the Districts and Public Engagement Overview and Scrutiny Committee carries out the *Devolution: Making it Real* inquiry:

“Devolution and localisation represent the biggest organisational and cultural change the City Council has faced

for a long time and we need to make sure we get it right. We invite other Members to develop and add to these issues. Through discussion and debate we hope that misapprehensions can be corrected and future necessary steps can be identified.”²³

- 7.3 The context of local government has also changed over the past decade and the financial challenges are great. The City Council's budget will be reduced by £330 million over 3-4 years (2011/12-13/14) which includes some £230 million from the council's core budget and £100 million from specific grants. This amounts to a third of the council's net spend in real terms. Appendix 6 illustrates merely the reduction to district budgets from last financial year to this as set out in the March budget. In addition, further budget cuts are to be expected affecting both the City Council and many of its partners during the next comprehensive spending review.
- 7.4 The devolution programme relaunched in 2012 is, therefore, being carried out at a time of unprecedented financial cutbacks and associated reductions in staffing. The new challenges going forward relate to managing expectations and thus ensuring clarity for councillors, officers, citizens and partners about the role of the council and its districts, including what can and can not be delivered. The challenge over the next 18 months is to harness the aspirations and to make devolution real.

Contact Officer:

Benita Wishart

Overview and Scrutiny Manager

0121 464 6871

benita.wishart@birmingham.gov.uk

Blog: <http://bhamdistrictsscrutiny.wordpress.com/>

²³ Policy and Performance Task and Finish O&S Committee (2004) *Devolution and Localisation Interim Issues Report*

Appendix 1: Original Terms of Reference of Constituency Committees 2004²⁴

Each Constituency Committee shall exercise all the Executive powers and duties of the Council with regard to matters relating to the area of the Constituency, as determined by the Cabinet, and, in particular, shall:-

1. Prepare an Annual Constituency Committee Plan and submit a draft copy of the same to the Cabinet for approval by the end of November of each year and finalise the Plan by the end of March in each year, after the Council has approved the Cabinet and Corporate Plan and the Annual Budget for the relevant year;
2. In accordance with any guidance issued by the Chief Financial Officer, shape budget priorities and expenditure within the Constituency and provide to the Cabinet, on an annual basis with the Draft Annual Constituency Committee Plan, a financial plan for the current and future financial years;
3. Once the Draft Annual Constituency Committee Plan, budget priorities and financial plan have been approved by the Cabinet, the Constituency Committee will be held accountable and responsible to the Cabinet for its delivery, in the geographical area of the Constituency Committee, to the set budget and any on-going performance management, monitoring, reviewing, development and auditing of the same, so as to ensure improving services to the citizens of Birmingham;
4. Identify the need for any new or improved partnership arrangements and resources within and, possibly, outside the Constituency and to refer the same to the Cabinet for consideration. If the Cabinet and/or the City Council agree to any such new or improved partnership arrangements and/or resources, the Constituency Committee will ensure the same are effectively and efficiently delivered in their Constituency and/or Ward levels;
5. Identify to the Cabinet further opportunities for devolution and neighbourhood management arrangements and keep under review local governance arrangements within the Constituency;
6. Make recommendations to the Cabinet, from time to time, in order to influence and inform the strategic and policy direction of the City Council;
7. Identify opportunities to improve the economic, social or environmental well being of the citizens of Birmingham and, in particular, those who live in the Constituency and to take action within any function/powers delegated to it or to refer the matter to the Cabinet for consideration;
8. Ensure the appropriate communication of policies and priorities of the City Council at a Constituency and/or Ward levels;

²⁴ Birmingham City Council (January 2004) *A Guide to Constitutional Issues Relating to Constituency Committees*

9. Consult with Constituency residents and/or local interest groups on those matters contained within these Terms of Reference;
10. In accordance with any best practice guidance issued by the Head of Paid Service, from time to time on performance management / review / reporting, prepare reports on and implement approved service improvements approved by the Cabinet;
11. In accordance with any best practice guidance issued by the Monitoring Officer, from time to time on constitutional, legal, probity or propriety issues, implement the same at the Constituency and/or Ward levels;
12. In accordance with any best practice guidance issued by the Chief Financial Officer, from time to time on financial / budgetary / personnel / property / IT matters, prepare and submit to the Chief Financial Officer regular budget monitoring reports and annual out-turn reports;
13. Following a recommendation of the Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Financial Officer, undertake any other Terms of Reference as the Cabinet may, from time to time, agree.

Appendix 2: Decision on Management of Services 2003²⁵

PROPOSED OPTION	SERVICES
<p>Level 1</p> <p>Services managed centrally that will continue to be managed in this way</p>	<p>Trading Services Regulation Recycling (bottle and can banks) Museums Central Library City-wide Arts and Events City-wide Sports Development City-wide Parks Services Benefits Administration Waste Disposal Car Parking Regulation</p>
<p>Level 2</p> <p>Existing local outlets that will come under constituency management</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Offices Leisure and Swimming Pools Community Libraries Community Centres</p>
<p>Level 3</p> <p>Services managed centrally that will continue To be managed in this way with a central client, but with constituency budgets to allow for local influence and planning (and potentially local staff)</p>	<p>Public Conveniences Road Maintenance (capital and revenue) Street Lighting Domestic Pest Control</p>
<p>Level 4</p> <p>Services to come under local management through service level agreements and fully localised budgets, but where physical operational structures (e.g. depots) might remain unchanged</p>	<p>Refuse Collection Street Cleaning Recycling (Doorstep) Parks Management Grounds Maintenance Playground Services Park Wardens/Rangers</p>
<p>Level 5</p> <p>Services that will be fully localised – i.e. all staff, management and budgets moved to 11 constituency offices</p>	<p>Community Development and Play Local Car Parks Maintenance and Income Local Arts Development Local Sports Development</p>

²⁵ Report to Cabinet Committee Devolution (June 2007) *Minimum Service Standards and Service Level Agreements – D & L Action Plan R7 and R10*

This differs slightly to from the L&D Project Plan 2003 e.g. pest control was level 5

Appendix 3: Recommendations from 2006

Overview and Scrutiny Report *Localisation and Devolution*

- R1 That, in the context of the established policy framework that the implementation of Devolution and Localisation should be cost neutral, fresh momentum be injected into the policy and clarity restored around costs, benefits, mechanisms and objectives by:
- (i) the drawing up of an Action Plan to address the recommendations made in this report for the short term,
 - and
 - (ii) the setting out of longer-term aims to be achieved over the next five years;
- this to be implemented by the Cabinet through the Cabinet Committee on Devolution.
- R2 That in order to give clarity to the whole Council and to partners and to remove resistance present in parts of the organisation, the Leader and the Chief Executive underline the permanence and importance of the policy of localisation and devolution. The Executive should also publicly state its determination to embed and develop these arrangements as a key element in developing customer focused public services, enhancing representative democracy and citizen engagement.
- R3 That the Cabinet Committee on Devolution become the major forum for communicating, discussing and settling issues between the Cabinet and District Committees, with a membership which includes as observer members at least one District Committee Chairman from each of the three Political Groups, but that should there be any unresolved divergences consideration be given to setting up a clearing mechanism.
- R4 That the Executive issue fresh and clear guidance on the division of responsibilities between Cabinet Members and District Committees, based on the principle that Cabinet's key interest is in seeing that the City Council's minimum acceptable service outcomes are achieved, but that how those outcomes are achieved is the business of the District Committees acting within the framework determined by the City Council.
- R5 That the District Committees use a common performance information system to report regularly to Cabinet Members (as well as the public) on service standards achieved in each District.
- R6 That in line with the developing practice of the City Council, greater investment be made in the development and career progression opportunities available to front line staff in the Districts.
- R7 That an Action Plan, with timescales, be drawn up identifying the minimum standards for all services to be provided in each District, with a costed menu of enhancements which Districts could commission within their available resources.

- R8 That, within extant budget constraints and without reducing service levels, the Executive set timescales for introducing revised means of allocating annual revenue budgets between Districts, so that allocations are related more clearly and equitably to need.
- R9 That, subject to contractual obligations and resources available, an Action Plan be drawn up to achieve unified ground cleaning services, with single teams cleaning an area regardless of which Directorate manages that land.
- R10 That the Executive prepare a paper, taking account of the views of Overview and Scrutiny, on those services currently determined by Service Level Agreements clearly showing the time-lines for which they are in place, any break clauses and how local variations can be made.
- R11 That the District Committees' apparent control of budgets for services delivered under Service Level Agreements be made meaningful by the service providers delivering detailed management information regarding budgets, activity costing and performance at Ward level.
- R12 That a paper be presented to the Cabinet Committee on Devolution clarifying the future intention of the Council regarding Community Based Housing Organisations.
- R13 That, in the interest of developing further the tenant-based housing landlord function, a paper be presented to the Cabinet Committee on Devolution, taking account of the views of Overview and Scrutiny, setting out how the Housing District Offices can work closer and better with the work of Districts, bearing in mind financial efficiency.
- R14 That the Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety promote the case for pilots where there is not an immediate and obvious case for diversity of service provision.
- R15 That the Executive, taking account of the views of Overview and Scrutiny, examine the priorities and timescales for the Devolution and Localisation of further City Council services.
- R16 That should the Cabinet revisit the structure of its portfolios this be carried out on the principle of the desirability of transferring further functions to District Committees, alongside the consideration of other principles designed to ensure effective management of Council services.
- R17 That, within existing resource constraints and without impacting on service levels, improvements be made to the financial, policy and performance management capacity alongside strengthening the client function to enhance Districts' ability to monitor services delivered.
- R18 That, whilst maintaining service delivery consistent with overall Council policy, a programme entitled "Cutting the Strings" be undertaken looking at those local decisions still currently requiring central approval with a view to a substantial reduction in their number and a simplification of processes in those

that remain.

- R19 That consideration be given to new and lighter touch reporting and monitoring arrangements for Districts.
- R20 That in its response to the forthcoming Local Government White Paper, the City Council impress on the Government the need to recognise that, whilst area committees derive their powers from cabinet delegations, members of the public must see local councillors taking decisions and not just passing on information.
- R21 That all Directorates indicate in their service plans how they intend to work collaboratively with the District machinery, including District Committees and District Strategic Partnerships, to deliver better services and improve citizen engagement.
- R22 That the current Asset Management Planning process be accelerated and enhanced to enable full District participation in considering the future use of all public property.
- R23 That the Executive and District Committee Chairmen, in conjunction with major partners, review District Strategic Partnership machinery to identify good practice, reduce sub-groups and eliminate inefficiencies.
- R24 That fresh guidance be issued concerning the provision of support services to District Strategic Partnership machinery to ensure that equitable shares are in future borne by all partners.
- R25 That each District Committee refresh its policy on its own role and that of Wards as a focus for citizen engagement, recognising that Ward activity does not always require formal Ward Committee arrangements and substantial officer support.
- R26 That the Executive's Action Plan drawn up in response to this scrutiny review also set out intentions for action following consultation on the forthcoming Birmingham Neighbourhoods Green Paper which the City Council intends to publish in summer 2006.
- R27 That the Action Plan give an early indication of how the City Council's Devolution and Localisation approach will develop in the light of the proposals in the expected Local Government White Paper.

Appendix 4: Principles of Localisation. The Response to the Future Shape of Localisation by the Local Services and Community Safety O&S Committee 2010

- 1. Local Councillors should be able to direct and control local services within their own locality.** The proposition that Councillors' "influence" is adequate, is not acceptable. The impetus to improve public services stems from public accountability (whereas it is the financial imperative in the private sector) and this rightly rests with Councillors.
- 2. Budget savings do not need to be made at the expense of local decision-making.** As the financial constraints bite and decisions need to be made about the future of some of our services, the essential question this consultation proposes is who should be at the forefront of that decision-making. We think, in a city this size, it should be local Councillors. Therefore, rather than re-centralising services being the only answer to the financial constraints, this is an opportunity to look at what further services could be advantageously devolved and how efficiencies can be made that way.
- 3. All public services will be better placed to make savings and retain service delivery if modelled on Place-Based Budgeting (formerly known as Total Place).** Significant savings need to be made across public services and these cannot be achieved by Birmingham City Council alone.
- 4. People engage with the City Council when they can see the benefits to their local area, can build relationships and feel valued.** Local structures have improved transparency of the Council and its working with/for local people and this should be retained.
- 5. Constituency Committees are the right size to be successful in improving partnership working with strategic partners** (such as Police and Health). Wards are too small and would entail partners having to attend a greatly increased number of meetings; Area Committees would be too large and remote from local concerns. However, work is needed to ensure local partnerships are ready to take the next steps necessary for place-based budgeting to be successful.
- 6. A review of local governance should take place regardless of outcome of consultation.** This should look at the number and purpose of meetings to ensure people are kept engaged and are able to make a useful contribution to service delivery.

7. **If some form of locality structures are retained, then these should have a champion at Cabinet level and their profile and influence in the decision making process raised.**

Appendix 6: Resourcing Devolution Recommendations

	Recommendation	Responsibility	Completion Date
R01	That the Cabinet Member for Finance, in the proposed review of the Community Chest, considers the guidance required to maximise its impact, including links with other funding streams, both internal and external, such as the Community First Programme, section 106 funds, community infrastructure levy (CIL) etc.	Cabinet Member for Finance	August 2012
R02	<p>That the Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety:</p> <p>Works with Constituency Chairmen to complete and implement the service review of Constituency Engineers to meet efficiency targets and improve the capacity of the team, with a view to being able to manage increased devolved budgets in the future; and</p> <p>a. Reports on the service review.</p> <p>Local Services and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee to examine impacts arising after 12 months through receiving evidence from the Cabinet Member for Transport Environment and Regeneration, Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety and appropriate officers.</p>	Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety	<p>Reporting on progress August 2012 & February 2013</p> <p>Completion August 2013</p>
R03	<p>In the light of cultural change that the Cabinet Members for Transport, Environment and Regeneration and Leisure, Sport and Culture hold discussions with ward and constituency chairmen in order to:</p> <p>a. Build flexibilities into updated service level agreements;</p> <p>b. Ensure the effective delivery of SLA services in meeting local needs; and</p> <p>c. Increase the local accountability of SLA services.</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Regeneration</p> <p>and</p> <p>Cabinet Member for Leisure, Sport and Culture</p>	November 2012
R04	<p>That the Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Regeneration identifies ward costs for the refuse collection and street based cleansing services; and reports these to ward committees, once ward based cleansing is embedded.</p> <p>This is in order to facilitate redirection of services which ward councillors may choose in the future and to aid any future decisions about service delivery.</p> <p>It is understood that in the medium term this will not</p>	Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Regeneration	February 2013

	include apportionment to wards of associated central support and depot and vehicle maintenance costs, but these costs should be identified and reported separately.		
R05	<p>That the Leader sets out robust protocols to strengthen and clarify the relationship between the city council, including directorates, and parish councils. To include information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing information with parish councils, including support for regular officer and multi-agency meetings; • Consulting parish councils; and • Delegation of services and budgets. 	The Leader	November 2012
R06	<p>That the Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implements the plans to appoint a Community Development Worker for each constituency within existing resources; b. Tasks the Community Development Workers to scope out the capacity needs of local communities and develop a constituency plan to build capacity; c. Enables the Community Development Workers to develop mechanisms and a structured approach to identify internal and external funding coming into a locality in order to determine how to maximise the impact of community chest and other local funding opportunities; d. Enables the Community Development Workers to develop skills to attract external funding; work with third sector organisations and residents; and liaise within the locality and across the city to ensure that areas and organisations are not competing unrealistically for the same funding streams; e. In order to assist Community Development Workers in carrying out their capacity building duty asks the strategic community development team to develop guidance (e.g. a toolkit) providing support and advice on processes and procedures for developing community capacity for Community Development Workers and other locality workers; and f. Provides feedback on the impact of this after 12 months (regarding the feasibility of one person delivering this challenging agenda and the impact on local communities). 	Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety	February 2013
R07	The Cabinet Members for Local Services and Community Safety and Leisure, Sport and Culture review the accountability and service delivery arrangements of community development, with the aim of simplifying or clarifying arrangements.	Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety and Cabinet Member	August 2012

		for Leisure, Sport and Culture	
RO8	The Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety to support Constituency Committees to develop mechanisms to ensure better exchange of best practice and lessons learnt for locality based activity (e.g. a web enabled data base and networking activities) within existing resources.	Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety	Progress report August 2012 Completion by February 2013
RO9	That the appropriate Cabinet Members [Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Regeneration; Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety; Cabinet Member for Finance] report on progress and emerging lessons from the various localism pilots to Constituency Chairmen, highlighting the potential for appropriate good practice be rolled out in localities. The pilots include, but are not restricted to: Community Based Budgeting in Shard End; neighbourhood and small area budgets in Castle Vale, Shard End, Balsall Heath and Handsworth and Lozells; neighbourhood planning in Balsall Heath; and other existing and potential pilots.	Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Regeneration; Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety; Cabinet Member for Finance	August 2013
R10	In the light of the cultural change to strengthen devolution, that the Cabinet Member for Finance develops appropriate assistance, support and resources to enable new Members (from the 2012 election) to carry out their roles effectively. This should include reviewing the induction process to reflect the new challenges for councillors in carrying out their roles, with particular regard to localism and locality working, and holding discussions with party leads about group member training programmes to complement this within existing resources.	Cabinet Member for Finance	August 2012
R11	That the Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety investigates methods for measuring the added value of locality working (e.g. by adapting the Valuing Worth approach).	Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety	November 2012
R12	That the Leader asks the Chief Executive to develop ward champions at JNC and Grade 7 level (excluding constituency officers) to: a. Add management support into wards and constituencies; b. Help wards avoid and navigate blockages and identify opportunities and ensure wards are better able to feed into the development of strategy; and c. Ensure that directorates have a mechanism for better understanding of local issues. This should be embedded through performance development reviews (PDRs) and a six monthly seminar	The Leader	August 2012

	with the Chief Executive to identify common issues and trends.		
R13	<p>That the Leader asks the Chief Executive to develop directorate locality champions. This would entail tasking a JNC lead officer in each directorate to co-ordinate and champion the work of the proposed ward champions and to support constituency and ward chairmen.</p> <p>The outcome of this should be for directorates and constituencies to have a better understanding of needs and challenges of the localism agenda; and to help localities navigate blockages and identify opportunities.</p>	The Leader	August 2012
R14	That the Leader formalises the Constituency Chairmen's group and the Chairman of that committee is invited to attend Cabinet meetings.	The Leader	June 2012
R15	<p>That the Leader requires all Cabinet Members to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement an annual review with constituency committees to examine budgets in order to identify if there are any budget headings which could be delegated to wards or constituencies; and b. Incorporate a constituency and ward element within each Cabinet Member's annual report to council [and six monthly updates to overview and scrutiny committees]. This should note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on localities; • Co-ordination of services with localities; • Liaison with local Members and other key stakeholders; and • A confirmation of when the annual review was carried out and the outcomes of this review. 	The Leader	<p>September 2012 report on progress</p> <p>Completion by June 2013</p>
R16	<p>That the Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety works with the Executive to:</p> <p>Develop a process to enable wards and constituencies to feed into the financial and policy decisions taken by the Executive; and</p> <p>Ensure that the Cabinet Members systematically consider the impact their decisions have on localities.</p> <p>Our suggested approach is to develop locality impact assessments (which could sit alongside equality analysis):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The suggested focus of these is a constituency focus, but ensuring there is the opportunity to draw out any specific or disproportionate impacts for wards or neighbourhoods. It will be necessary to develop ways of consulting at a locality level with key stakeholders including, but not exclusive to Constituency Service Integration Heads and the proposed ward champions to develop a locality test. • The locality impact should be included as a 	Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety	<p>August 2012 on a trial to develop a process</p> <p>Completion by February 2013</p>

	<p>compliance issue on the decision-making template.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is suggested that this approach be trialled and this be reported back in August 2012, prior to council-wide implementation. • The process needs to be easy to administer, cost effective and incorporated in the Executive decision making protocol. 		
R17	<p>Progress towards achievement of these recommendations should be reported to the Local Services and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee in October 2012. Subsequent progress reports will be scheduled by the Committee thereafter, until all recommendations are implemented.</p>	<p>Cabinet Member for Local Services and Community Safety</p>	<p>October 2012</p>

Contact:

Benita Wishart
 Overview and Scrutiny Manager
 Tel: 0121 464 6871
benita.wishart@birmingham.gov.uk

Appendix 6: Constituency Budget Reductions 2011–2013²⁶

Constituencies	2011/12	2012/3
Edgbaston	7.897	7.433
Erdington	9.254	8.759
Hall Green	8.878	8.439
Hodge Hill	7.768	7.568
Ladywood	14.101	13.506
Northfield	8.975	8.652
Perry Barr	9.147	8.584
Selly Oak	9.096	8.529
Sutton Coldfield	8.847	8.250
Yardley	9.122	8.572
Citywide Constituencies	2.573	5.084

²⁶ Birmingham City Council (2012) *Birmingham Budget 2012/13*